

REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed November 12, 2008 the Office noted that claims 1-14 were pending and rejected claims 1-14. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, claims 15 and 16 are new, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-16 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claims 1 and 8 stand objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office asserts that claims are missing words or contain plurality issues. The Applicants have amended the claims.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular the Office asserts that the claims contain antecedent basis issues.

The Applicants have amended the claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 7-8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Breslow, U.S. Patent No. 2007/0058656 in view of Sonning, U.S. Patent No. 6,717,933 in further view of Nurmela, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120622. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a "method for *linking program code in a processor instruction memory comprising rows and columns*, the program code comprising a plurality of instructions for processing data packets in a communications network, the method comprising: dividing the program code into a plurality of sequences, each sequence *comprising a number of instructions steps and being configured* to perform a certain task on a data packet passing through the communications network; defining, based on the program code, a plurality of relocation objects, each relocation object of the plurality of relocation objects corresponding to a dependency relationship between two or more of the sequences; *allocating each sequence to at least one row and at least one column of the processor instruction memory such that the instruction steps of the sequence are consecutively allocated in the processor instruction memory; and linking a first sequence to a second sequence by using a defined relocation object corresponding to a dependency relationship between the first sequence and the second sequence, to define a branch from*

*the first sequence to the second sequence."* Support for the amendment may be found, for example, on page 3, line 20 through page 4, line 3; page 4, lines 22-26 of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the amendment of claims 1. Claim 8 has been amended in a manner consistent with the amendment to claim 1.

None of the cited documents relate to a method and a system for linking of program code in a processor instruction memory, the program code comprising a plurality of instructions for processing data packets in a communications network, as the method and system defined by the amended claims 1 and 8, respectively.

None of the cited documents relate to a method and a system for linking of program code in a processor instruction memory, the program code comprising a plurality of instructions for processing data packets in a communications network, as the method and system defined by the amended claims 1 and 8, respectively.

For example, Breslow discusses data transmission in a data communication network, wherein data messages sent through the digital data communication and other communication network are divided into one or more digital data "packets". See ¶ 0041. Thus, Breslow does not refer to linking program code in a processor instruction memory.

Further, Sonning discusses to a converter of a CDMA

system in which an input data stream of consecutive data packets is converted into an output data symbol stream, and thus has nothing to do with linking program code in a processor instruction memory.

Furthermore, the converter discussed in Sonning contains a memory means having a predetermined number of columns and rows and a write means writing data packets (consisting of sequentially arranged data symbols) into the memory. (See col. 6 lines 52-56)

The memory discussed in Sonning is a data memory. A data memory is different from an instruction memory. As known by those of ordinary skill in the art, data is stored in a data memory and instructions are stored in an instruction memory. Thus, the data memory in Sonning is different from the instruction memory in the claims as the data memory comprises different information and is used for different purposes as compared to an instruction memory. For example, data stored in a data memory is movable while instructions stored in an instruction memory are kept in place.

Further, neither Nurmela discusses linking program code in a processor instruction memory. Instead, Nurmela discusses data packet filtering and finding a rule matching a data packet in a rule base of e.g. a firewall. The action of a rule may be instructions for handling the data packet, e.g. deny or allow the packet to proceed [0053]. Alternatively, the action may indicate

that a further rule needs to be found and Nurmela mentions that a JUMP action in firewalls defines the rule to which to jump in cases wherein a further rule needs to be found.

A jump action, as discussed in Nurmela, is thus an action to look up rules in a table and the jump action is performed while executing a computer program. The jump action is thus completely different from a relocation object since the relocation object is defined by the assembler/compiler and is used as an input by the linker to link sequences of program code to each other. When the linking is performed the linked sequences of program code realizes a computer program that when executed on a computer could perform a jump action to look up rules in a table. Thus, a relocation object is an input to a linking procedure and a jump action is an output of the linking procedure.

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the references to find the claimed invention.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Breslow, Sonning, and Nurmela, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 1 and 8 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 2-6 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Breslow in view of Sonning in further view of Nurmela in view of Wagner, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023388. The Applicants respectfully

disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Wagner adds nothing to the combination Breslow, Sonning, and Nurmela as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Breslow, Sonning, Nurmela and Wagner, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claims 2-6 and 9-13.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### NEW CLAIMS

Claims 15 and 16 are new. Support for claims 15 and 16 may be found, for example, in page 3, line 30 through page 4, line 1. The Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the addition of claims 15 and 16. The prior art fails to disclose that the allocating each sequence to at least one row and at least one column of the processor instruction memory is performed by allocating to the same row but in different columns.

#### SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-16 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./  
James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Reg.No. 55,394  
209 Madison St, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jr